



**METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
Tel.: 510.464.7700
TTY/TDD: 510.464.7769
Fax: 510.464.7848
e-mail: info@mtc.ca.gov
Web site: www.mtc.ca.gov

Steve Kinsey, Chair
Marin County and Cities

Jon Rubin, Vice Chair
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Tom Avoniusso
City and County of San Francisco

Irene Anderson
Cities of Contra Costa County

Tom Aramburo
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

James T. Beall Jr.
Santa Clara County

Mark DeSautier
Contra Costa County

Bill Dudd
Napa County and Cities

Deanne M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Barbara Kaufman
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Sue Lempert
Cities of San Mateo County

John McLennan
Cities of Santa Clara County

Michael D. Neslin
San Mateo County

Rajan Saripati
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spiering
Solano County and Cities

Patricia Tortorelli
Association of Bay Area Governments

Sharon Wright
Sonoma County and Cities

Sbelis Young
Cities of Alameda County

Steve Heninger
Executive Director

Ann Flenner
Deputy Director/Operations

Therese W. McMillan
Deputy Director/Policy

July 18, 2005

**ADDENDUM No. 1
To
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS, DATED JUNE 20, 2005
FOR TRANSIT TRIP PLANNING SOFTWARE**

Dear Vendor:

This addendum modifies the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for transit trip planning software issued June 20, 2005. Where applicable, text additions are underlined and text deletions are ~~lined out~~.

<u>Addendum Item</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Change(s)</u>
1	RFQ, pages 1 and 3 and Appendix B, page 10	The requested due date for receipt of SOQs has been changed to 4:00 PM on Wednesday, July 27, 2005.
2	RFQ, page 1:	The following sentence is added after MTC's mailing address: <u>"Do not mail or deliver SOQs to MTC's offices at 1999 Harrison Street, 17th Floor, Oakland, CA."</u>
3	RFQ, page 2:	The last sentence in the second paragraph is changed as follows: "MTC will provide <u>only vendor contact</u> information collected through this RFQ as supporting documentation to the RFP."
4	RFQ, page 2:	The following language is added to the section entitled, "Background," following the third paragraph: <u>"The purpose of the RFQ is to:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>Identify currently operational, commercially available trip planning software systems that might replace MTC's current trip planning software;</u>

<u>Addendum Item</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Change(s)</u>
4 (cont.)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Assess how well existing trip planning software systems meet MTC’s desired features and functions;</u> • <u>Inform the final set of trip planning software features and functions to be included in the RFP; and</u> • <u>Allow potential RFP prime proposers to know the identities of transit trip planning software vendors.”</u>
5	RFQ, page 2:	<p>The first sentence under the heading, “SOQ Minimum Qualifications” is changed as follows:</p> <p>“For MTC to include your SOQ firm’s <u>contact information</u> as supporting documentation to the RFP, a vendor must meet the following minimum qualifications.”</p>
6	RFQ, page 4:	<p>The first non-bulleted, non-numbered paragraph is deleted as follows:</p> <p>“Because MTC will post SOQs on the Internet, SOQs shall not include any proprietary information that vendors do not wish to make public.</p>
7	RFQ, page 4:	<p>The paragraph following the heading, “MTC Evaluation” is changed as follows:</p> <p><u>“Vendor contact information (only) for SOQs meeting the minimum qualifications described on page 2 will be posted on MTC’s website as a resource materials for potential bidders to the RTIS Project Contractor RFP. MTC will not evaluate or rank the information provided in Appendix C-1. Contact information for vendors submitting SOQs submitted</u> past the specified due date may not, at MTC’s sole discretion, be provided as supporting documentation to the RFP.”</p>
8	RFQ, page 4:	<p>Insert the following after the first sentence under General Conditions:</p> <p><u>This RFQ and any material submitted in response to this RFQ are subject to public inspection under the California Public Records Act (Government Code § 6250 et seq.), unless exempt by law. Other than proprietary information or other information exempt from disclosure by law, the content of SOQs submitted to MTC will be</u></p>

<u>Addendum Item</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Change(s)</u>
8 (cont.)		<p><u>made available for inspection consistent with its policy regarding Public Records Act requests.</u></p> <p><u>Each respondent must clearly mark each page of the SOQ that the respondent considers to contain trade secrets or other commercial or financial information that the respondent believes would cause substantial injury to the respondent’s competitive position, if disclosed, and include the following notice at the front of its SOQ:</u></p> <p><u>“The data on the following pages of this SOQ, marked along the right margin with a vertical line, contain technical or financial information which are trade secrets and/or which, if disclosed, would cause substantial injury to the respondent’s competitive position. The respondent requests that such data be used for review by MTC only, but understands that exemption from disclosure will be limited by MTC’s obligations under the California Public Records Act. If a contract is awarded to a team that includes the vendor submitting this SOQ, MTC shall have the right to use or disclose the data, unless otherwise provided by law [List pages].”</u></p> <p><u>Failure to include this notice with relevant page numbers shall render any individual markings inadequate. Individual pages shall accordingly not be treated confidentially. Any language purporting to render the entire SOQ or the entire Table C-1 confidential or proprietary will be regarded as ineffective and will be disregarded.</u></p> <p><u>In the event properly marked data are requested pursuant to the California Public Records Act, the respondent will be advised of the request and given the opportunity to provide to MTC a detailed statement indicating the reasons it believes the information should be withheld from disclosure. The respondent may be asked by MTC, as a condition of non-disclosure, to indemnify and hold MTC harmless, in the event of claims made as a result of non-disclosure.”</u></p>
9	Appendix A, page 6:	The last sentence of the fourth paragraph is changed as follows:

<u>Addendum Item</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Change(s)</u>
9 (cont.)		<p>“We <u>MTC</u> would like to implement a software system that could potentially be used in other regions. <u>For software modules/products developed under the prospective RTIS contract, MTC intends to own them and retain the ability to license them to other public agencies.”</u></p>
10	Appendix B, page 8:	<p>The last sentence of the first paragraph is changed as follows:</p> <p><u>“MTC will provide the contact information of vendors submitting SOQs and meeting the minimum qualifications described on page 2 of the RFQ the information about the functionality of currently operational, commercially available transit trip planning software gathered through this RFQ as supporting documentation to the RFP. MTC will instruct firms wishing to respond to the RFP to contact RFQ respondents directly.”</u></p>
11	Appendix B, page 8:	<p>The last sentence of the first paragraph following the heading, “Request for Proposal (RFP) for a Regional Transit Information System (RTIS) Project Contractor” is changed as follows:</p> <p><u>“Firms responding to the RFP may use the list of software vendors responding to this RFQ SOQs to identify potential software vendors for their proposals, but they are not limited to this list.”</u></p>
12	Appendix B, page 9:	<p>The third sentence of the first paragraph following the heading, “Step 1: Proposals with Trip Planning “Buy” Recommendations” is changed as follows:</p> <p><u>“To facilitate proposers’ recommendations, MTC will provide vendor contact information about the different software packages that MTC collected through this RFQ.”</u></p>
13	Appendix C, Section 1.4.1, page 16:	<p>The last sentence in this section is changed as follows:</p> <p><u>“This software has limited use and will eventually be replaced by the XML interface described below above.”</u></p>
14	Appendix C, Section 7.0, page 43:	<p>The following sentence is added to the last paragraph of Section 7.0:</p> <p><u>“It is MTC’s intent to maintain the basic structure of the RTIS, which features a central database (the RTD) that provides information to multiple applications. As one of these applications, the trip planner must be integrated with all elements of the RTIS to be compatible.”</u></p>
15	Page 55:	<p>The heading is changed to “Appendix D”.</p>
16	Appendix D, Section 5.0, page 57:	<p><u>“The “RTD schema and data dictionary” is intellectual property of MTC. MTC can provide a copy intends to make copies of the “RTD schema and data dictionary” document available through a process that will occur subsequent to this RFQ and under conditions specified</u></p>

<u>Addendum Item</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Change(s)</u>
--------------------------	------------------	------------------

~~in the RFP. after receiving a signed copy of the agency's Non-Disclosure Agreement.~~

All other provisions of the RFQ not inconsistent with these revisions remain in force.

Also included with this Addendum #1 are MTC's answers to questions posed by interested organizations at the Question and Answer Session on June 29th, 2005, and to subsequent questions submitted via email prior to the July 6, 2005 deadline (Attachment A). Attachment B shows a list of organizations that either attended the Question and Answer Session, or indicated that they were interested but could not attend. Please note that some answers to questions posed at the Proposers' Conference have been modified with the intention of improving clarity.

Sincerely,

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

SH: TS: BL

Enclosures (2)

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\CONTRACT\Procurements\Software & Technical Support\
RFQ & RFP\RTIS RFQ-RFP\RFQ\Addendum #1_final.doc

ATTACHMENT A to Addendum #1

Regional Transit Information System Transit Trip Planning Software Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Questions and Answers

Vendor Questions and MTC Answers at Question and Answer Session on June 29, 2005

Questions are shown in *italics*. Answers are shown in regular font.

1. *What is the importance of the criteria for the trip planner in the evaluation of the RTIS proposals?*

The trip planner is a very important component of the RTIS, but the trip planning software recommended by the proposing team will not exclusively drive the selection decision. Our evaluation criteria will evaluate all elements of proposals. The RFP will discuss the priority and importance of each criterion.

2. *The Proposal will be from the contractor, not the software developer, correct?*

We anticipate that proposals will come from teams that include the type of firms needed to operate the RTIS and also provide transit trip planning software. A software vendor firm is not precluded from being a prime proposer for the RTIS project contract.

3. *What is an example of the licensed interface?*

Airports want to code specific origins and destinations. The airport might always be the hard-coded destination. The trip planner could have the look and feel of the airport's website. Outstanding questions remain about the amount of customization that MTC would allow in the licensed interface, because there are support costs associated with customization. There also may be Intellectual Property issues associated with any new interfaces developed as part of the customization. We hope to get some insight into the various trade-offs in responses to this RFQ.

4. *The SOQs will be posted on the Internet. How does a software vendor make MTC aware of proprietary information? Instead of posting the SOQs on the MTC website, could MTC control the release of the SOQs to potential prime RFP bidders? Could MTC ask prime bidders to sign a waiver that they will use this information only to respond to the RTIS Project Contractor RFP? Would it be acceptable to respond to this RFQ without completing Appendix C-1?*

Addendum #1 to the RFQ states how respondents should make MTC aware of proprietary information and clarifies MTC's intent to post only the contact information of firms that submit SOQs on our Website. Through the RFP, MTC will inform potential bidders of the RFQ process and the list of firms that responded to the RFQ. MTC's intent in making the list available is to allow potential prime proposers to the RFP to contact RFQ respondents directly for team-building purposes. RFQ respondents will have discretion over what, and how much, information to share with firms that contact them regarding this RFQ-RFP process. Vendors who respond to the RFQ must complete *Appendix C-1*.

5. *Is bd Systems restricted from bidding on the RFP? (Note: bd Systems is the current RTIS Project Contractor.)*

No. bd Systems has helped MTC document the current RTIS and will continue to do so, but they are not involved in developing the RTIS procurement and will not be prohibited from responding to the RFP.

6. *Can vendors submit more general questions about the RTIS by the RFQ question deadline?*
Yes.

7. *It looks like Appendix C-1 abbreviates the feature or function as described in Appendix C. When vendors complete Appendix C-1, should they refer back to the corresponding section of Appendix C to understand the full depth of what MTC wants vendors to respond to?*
Yes.

8. *Would you say that the Functional Needs are a "wish list" of what MTC wants?*

The Trip Planning Software Functional Needs explains MTC's desired features and functions of the new trip planning software. After receiving the SOQs, MTC may modify the Functional Needs for ultimate inclusion in the RFP.

9. *How can vendors explain to MTC potential trade-offs through the SOQs? For example, functionality versus potential cost.*

MTC would appreciate it if the SOQs explain the trade-offs, either cost-wise or difficulty-wise, of trying to implement certain desired features and functions. Because MTC has decided not to post the SOQs on its Website, we hope that vendors will be able to provide as much detail as possible when completing their SOQs. This information will be used by MTC to help refine the desired software features and functions that MTC includes in the RFP Scope of Work.

10. *How will MTC handle the cost of adding certain features and functions?*

If MTC does not have the budget to implement certain features, we may defer their implementation.

11. *Section 1.4.1 of Appendix C says that XML is described below.*

This should say “above.”

12. *Appendix C Section 3.1.3.4 says up to 4 options, but the corresponding section of Appendix C-1 says two. Can you explain the discrepancy?*

The four options described in Appendix C, 3.1.3.4 refer to “prefer to include,” “must include,” “exclude,” and “only.” (A fifth default option is “any.”) The two options mentioned in the corresponding sections of Appendix C-1 refer to the two modes or two operators that a user may elect to include or exclude.

13. *In Appendix C, Section 3.3.1.4 what is meant by “The maps shall also provide navigation features that allow the user to examine the areas surrounding the suggested transit route and transfer points”?*

The map should have GIS capability to show other attributes in the surrounding area that are in the GIS database, e.g., other bus stops, landmarks, points of interest, etc.

14. *Appendix C asks that users be able to email the system administrator from the website. Does MTC envision a link? Should the itinerary be automatically pulled into the email? Are there any concerns with e-mail spam ?*

The website currently has the capability to allow people who have generated an itinerary to email the system administrator. The email is attached to a URL, which, when linked, describes the itinerary by origin and destination, but the itinerary is not attached. With the current system, there is little room in the message area on the comment form to use for spamming purposes.

15. *In Appendix C, Section 6.4, the performance criteria are described as TBD. When will these be determined?*

MTC, with input from its technical advisor, will finalize performance requirements by the time the RFP is issued.

16. *How many hits/day does the site currently receive? Does MTC have a growth factor goal? How many itineraries/day are generated? What is the number of runs in the system?*

- Hits/day: 105,000 to 110,000
- Itineraries/day: 16,000
- In the last year, the number of itineraries generated per day has grown approximately 30%. This growth may be larger than what could be anticipated in the future, because a few major transit operators were added to the system during this time. If MTC decides to include the trip planner’s coverage area beyond the 9-county Bay Area, then this growth may be greater.

- MTC wants to continue to increase the number of itineraries generated and the overall user base, but we do not have specific goals as yet. MTC has not specifically marketed the trip planner, although 511, in general, has been marketed. MTC has been concerned about marketing the trip planner, because we are not confident about TranStar's capabilities for significant increases in usage.
- There are about 53,000 trips (or runs) in the system. A trip (run) is one record (line item) in a transit schedule. All of the core transit operators are already in the system, but there are several smaller operators that need to be added, so this number of runs will grow.

17. *Describe the budget.*

Please see the RFQ, page 3.

18. *For evaluation purposes, how will you decide if the "buy" option is acceptable? For example, MTC has 143 desired features and functions. Will MTC say that the buy option has to satisfy X%, otherwise MTC will move to the build?*

MTC has not yet determined the criteria for moving to Step 2, but this will be part of the RFP evaluation criteria. The more information MTC receives through the RFP process, the greater our ability to specify what will be sufficient functionality in the "buy" scenario.

19. *Does MTC think it will want to voice-enable the trip planner some day?*

Yes, we view that as a future, optional feature. However, our implementation strategy is to initially "keep it simple" and to add enhancements incrementally over time. Appendix C Section 8 talks about some of the features that MTC would like to have in the long-term, but that we are not prioritizing at this point.

20. *What will be the period of performance for the buy or build options?*

For a buy option, it will depend on the degree of customization needed. The expectation is that it could be just a few months to up to a year. For the build option, MTC anticipates it could take about 18 to 24 months. Of course, the period of performance for operations and maintenance will be longer; we currently anticipate five years of performance for operations and maintenance.

Vendor Questions emailed to MTC prior to July 6, 2005 due date, and MTC Answers
Questions are shown in *italics*. Answers are shown in regular font.

21. *Section 2.1 - RTIS integration: The trip planner software is expected to access the RTD to obtain data on transit service and the GIS services to obtain GIS data. Is this a hard requirement or is it possible to use these two databases to feed a separate database than for the trip planning software?*

Our understanding of this question is that by “access” the questioner means a direct interface between the RTD and the Trip Planner and by “use to feed” the questioner means that output from the RTD (e.g., XML or text) would go into the software’s back-end database.

The RTD and GIS databases need to remain core components of the RTIS. Different interface strategies may be proposed. MTC, however, wants to ensure that the interface configuration would not preclude MTC’s ability to share MTC’s system with other agencies.

Please also see RFQ, Appendix C, Section 7.2, which explains RTIS/Trip Planner interface scenarios.

Please see also the RFQ addendum, which explains: “It is MTC’s intent to maintain the basic structure of the RTIS, which features a central database (the RTD) that provides information to multiple applications. As one of these applications, the trip planner will be integrated with the RTIS to be compatible.”

22. *Section 3.1.1 – Geocoding / Address matching: In this section there are features which the vendor considers part of the address matcher / geocoder service. Are these features / functions supported by the MTC address matcher service that is referenced in Section 3.2.2?*

Yes.

23. *Section 3.1.1.7 – Mapping “service”: Please clarify if the mapping service provided by MTC, as referenced in section 3.2.1, supports the type of functionality as identified in Section 3.1.1.7?*

Section 3.2.1 describes the general functions of the mapping service and map display. These functions describe the broader set of functions that include those described in Section 3.1.1.7. Section 3.1.1.7 describes the map icon selection tool on the current Trip Planner’s entry form. Both sets of functions can be provided by accessing the GIS capabilities of the RTIS.

24. *Browser based call center: While the RFQ calls for a browser based Call Center User Interface, will MTC consider software which provides all the functionality identified but utilizes a “thin” or “lite weight” client? In this situation thin / lite weight means the client software has a very small foot print on each workstation and communicates only with server(s) providing the core trip planning functionality. The client software does not utilize or require any form of database connectivity.*

Page 2 of the Letter of Invitation in the RFQ explains that *Appendix C* describes the desired features and functions of the trip planning software, but that a firm may submit a response that does not include all the desired features and functions. Similarly, a firm may suggest a different approach or feature than what MTC has identified in *Appendix C*. The features and functions identified in *Appendix C*, however, reflect MTC’s current preferences. These preferences may be informed by SOQs.

25. *Trip Plan User Interface: Most of the features for the public web site appear to be currently provided by the current trip planner at <http://transit.511.org/tripplanner/index.asp>. Does MTC anticipate replacing the current trip planner or “simply” changing the engine which supports the current UI?*

The public website includes the trip planner as well as basic transit schedules, maps and other transit information. Much of this basic information is not output directly from the trip planner, but by dynamic access and display on other web pages from MTC’s Regional Transit Database (RTD), which also supplies data to the trip planner.

MTC anticipates replacing the trip planner software. We also anticipate that the engine that transfers data from the RTD to the trip planner would require modifications, as it is currently designed to provide data to the trip planner that will be replaced.

26. *Vendors requested MTC’s Non-Disclosure Agreement in order to obtain MTC’s RTD schema, data dictionary and RTD XML schema.*

The RFQ has been revised through Addendum #1 so that MTC will make only the RTD XML schema intellectual property (used to transfer data from transit agencies to MTC) available through the RFQ process, and requiring an NDA. Any additional intellectual property that MTC determines to make available will be through the RFP (not the RFQ) process under conditions to be stated in the RFP.

27. *Is a complete DTD or XML Schema definition of all existing XML interfaces available? (Geocoding XML interface, trip planner web service interface, RTD data export XML interface)*

The RFQ has been revised through Addendum #1 so that MTC will make only the RTD XML schema intellectual property (used to transfer data from transit agencies to MTC) available through the RFQ process, and requiring an NDA. Any additional intellectual property that MTC determines to make available will be through the RFP (not the RFQ) process under conditions to be stated in the RFP.

28. *See section 6.2.2 to 6.2.7: Are any of the mentioned data entities (walking speeds, max. walking distances, links, transfer times, modes, fares data) already part of the RTD data schema? Where in the RTD database schema can these data entities be found?*

Walking speed and transfer time are part of the TranStar configuration. Maximum walking distance is part of an itinerary request (specified by a user using the web interface), at the same time that there is default value in the TranStar. Fare data and mode information is part of the RTD but isn't used by TranStar, which keeps its own copy of this information, and is maintained manually. Links are maintained in TranStar, not in the RTD.

29. *See section 7.2.2, Live data editing capabilities: Which data is expected to be able to edit directly within the trip planner? Please supply a database schema or a list of entities that is expected to be edited.*

How or what data to be edited directly within the trip planner would be at the discretion of the software vendor/proposer. Currently, the editing is carried out by the project consultant, for standard transit data such as stops, routes, etc. There is a capability for some direct editing of their own trip planner data by transit agencies in the current trip planner interface, but due to the learning curve and the risks of altering live data erroneously, this feature is not being used by the participating transit agencies themselves.

30. *See section 7.1.6 XML Interface to RTD: How time consuming is an automated XML export from RTD? How long would it take to export a complete set of all schedules, routes, patterns, stops and all other data required for trip itinerary planning for the whole SF Bay Area? Is this a question of minutes, hours (how many?) or days?*

The time required to load the XML data into the production database is proportional to a) the number of trips/schedules; b) GIS geometry features included; c) hardware; and d) the bandwidth of the network. Assuming the current database server configuration and the network configuration remains the same, in one hour approximately 30,000 schedule values (along with the related route/pattern/stop/trip data) could be loaded. Given the current 415,102 schedules for 53,323 trips, it would theoretically take about 14 hours to load the complete data. But the complete data cannot currently be loaded in one run, as data needs to be loaded separately for each of the agencies.

31. *How many stops, routes, patterns are in a full set of scheduling data to be used by the trip planner for the whole SF bay area? How will these numbers grow within the next two or three years?*

Current figures for the RTD (subject to fluctuation with service changes):

Routes: 587
Patterns: 2,528
Stops: 24,343
Trips: 53,323
Schedules: 415,102
Landmarks: 3,159

Please also see the answer to question #16.

32. *How many of the physical stops are time points (percentage)?*

Roughly 17% (approximately 4,100).

33. *Section 2.2 System Hardware Configuration: The RFQ states that the new trip planner is expected to replace the servers currently supporting the TranStar system. Are we correct in interpreting this as we are able to replace the OpenVMS TranStar servers with new Linux or Windows servers for the new components? If yes, will procurement of the required hardware be part of the RTIS RFP and who will be responsible, MTC or the RFP bidder?*

Yes, the interpretation is correct. New servers, however, will have to support the existing RTIS and the trip planner software. The cost of server replacement would be included in the \$1 to \$1.5 million budget available for acquisition and integration of the new trip planning software described on page 3 of the RFQ. The team that wins the RTIS Project Contract will be responsible for hardware procurement.

34. *Section 2.2: System Hardware Configuration Figure 2 and 3: How are the current Web Services distributed across Web 1 and Web 2 in the current environment? Are there any existing Load Balancing hardware and/or software components in place in the current environment for the load balancing of web requests to Web 1 and Web 2? If yes, can specifics be provided?*

Current web services are running on both web servers (they use identical hardware and software, there are identical web applications and services deployed on them). Web1 and Web2 (and additional transit.511.org web servers if needed) are running as a load balanced cluster using MS Windows 2000 AS Network Load Balancing (equal load on both servers on port 80 using single affinity).

35. *Section 7.1.1 Itinerary Web Services: Does the MTC want the new trip planning application to use the existing web pages or have the successful bidder implement new pages based on the new system?*

MTC anticipates that the successful RFP bidder will make changes to the 511 transit website. Changes to the website, however, would be consistent with the 511 Website style. A task of the RTIS Project Contractor is website maintenance and development.

ATTACHMENT B
To Addendum #1

Regional Transit Information System
Transit Trip Planning Software Request for Qualifications (RFQ)
Question and Answer Session held on June 29, 2005

LIST OF INTERESTED ORGANIZATIONS

Name	Organization	Phone	Email
Attendees – Consultants/Vendors			
Lisa Woodward	Parson Brinckerhoff	219-896-5670	woodward@pbworld.com
Gerard Kirchtag	Ontira	604-669-1070	gkirchtag@ontira.com
Mike Schwinden	Trapeze Group	602-663-7436	mikesc@trapezegroup.com
Satinder Bhalla	bd Systems	510-664-0884	sbhalla@oc.bdsys.com
G. Praspaliauskas	bd Systems	510-663-0884	gpk@oc.bdsys.com
Rich Shinn	DKS	510-763-2061	rshinn@dksassociates.com
Walter Allen	Acumen	510-530-3029	Walter@acumen-ABE.com
Not Present, But Expressed Interest in Q & A or Submitted Questions After Q & A Session			
Nisar Ahmed	Psomas		nahmed@psomas.com
Matt Kaufman	NextInsight	845.300.2210	matt@nextinsight.com
Meinte Wildschut	EDS Travel & Transportation Solutions Centre	+31 181 502 686	meinte.wildschut@eds.com
François Carignan	GIRO Inc.	514-383-0404	francois.carignan@giro.ca
Peter Talke	HaCon Ingenieurgesellschaft mbH	+49 (0) 511 33699-220	pta@hacon.de
Daniel Pelletier	GIRO Inc	514-383-0404	daniel.pelletier@giro.ca
Marsha Kaye	Trapeze Group	(480) 315-5027	Marsha.Kaye@trapezegroup.com